

# KING COUNTY LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

*Tuesday, January 22, 2013  
4:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.  
Tipping Floor Conference Room #7255  
King Street Center  
201 S. Jackson Street  
Seattle, Washington*

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Tom Hitzroth, Vice Chair; Poppi Handy; Lorelea Hudson; Kji Kelly; Mary McCormick; Thaisa Way; Lynette Weber

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Julie Koler; Todd Scott; Charlie Sundberg

**GUESTS:** John Chaney; Steve Hammer; Curtis Lang; Jeff Potter

**CALL TO ORDER:** Vice Chair Hitzroth called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm. Newly appointed commissioners Poppi Handy and Mary McCormick introduced themselves.

**ELECTION OF OFFICERS:** Hitzroth opened the floor to nominations. Commissioner Way nominated Hitzroth for Chair. The nomination passed unanimously. Commissioner Weber nominated Lorelea Hudson for Vice Chair. Hudson declined the nomination citing too many other commitments. Commissioner Hudson nominated Handy as Vice Chair. The nomination passed unanimously. McCormick and Handy both abstained from voting on either nomination as they have not yet passed the probationary period of 30 days before they can vote on commission actions.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There was no public comment.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Hitzroth asked for additions or amendments to the December minutes. Hearing none he called for a motion to approve the December 20, 2012 minutes as submitted. Kelly so moved and the motion passed unanimously. McCormick and Handy abstained.

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER'S REPORT:** Koler passed out the new commissioner roster, and stated that there had been a request to change commission meeting dates to the fourth Tuesday rather from the fourth Thursday. There was consensus that this would work for everyone. Koler then made a brief presentation on the county's historic preservation program, for the new commissioners.

## **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

- **Olof Olson House and Barn (COA No. 1301)** – to modify roofing and fenestration

Scott described the proposed project and said the design review committee (DRC) determined that *Secretary of the Interior's Standards 3, 5, 9 and 10* are applicable to the application. Steve Hammer, architect for the project, and Jeff Potter, the applicant, made an additional presentation about the proposed changes, indicating that it improved the overall aesthetics of the loft. Way asked why the two roof options (interior insulation vs. exterior insulation) aren't equal. Hammer indicated that if they went the exterior insulation route, additional structural members would have to be added. Way asked why they were using faux barn doors. Hammer stated that the owner likes the fact that it is a barn, and although it is no longer used as such, they wanted to maintain some reminders of its previous use. Handy asked if the internal ceiling joists would still be visible on the barrel vault. Hammer stated yes, but they would only be about half as deep as they are currently, to allow for insulation and new decking between them. Hitzroth asked what happens to the original wood members when spray-on insulation is added. Hammer stated that technically it is reversible, but it would not be easy. The members would have to be lightly sanded in order to remove all of the insulation. Way asked if a membrane of some type could be put between the insulation and the wood. Hammer said that was unlikely. Handy asked if a consultant had looked to see whether spray insulation has a significant effect on the R-values of the roof. Hammer said no.

Kelly asked what the exterior roof shingle exposure is currently. Hammer said it was approximately 12 inches. Way indicated that they are doing quite a lot cumulatively, and it feels pretty significant, enough so that she is a little concerned. Hudson reminded everyone that this is an adaptive reuse project, not a restoration, and the use is significantly different from the original. Way responded that many of the changes being proposed are irreversible, in real terms. Scott also indicated that the commission had previously discussed the hope that this project could serve as a model for other potential agricultural properties, as many of them start to lose any possibility for real ag uses. Curtis Lang, a contractor for the project stated that there is always a tricky line between what needs to be saved and how to use the resource. For him, keeping the most critical components is key. Kelly asked if there was enough loft floor decking to create the new ceiling finish. Lang said yes. Kelly also asked if the windows on the south elevation will match other historic windows on the building. Hammer indicated they would, but would be new construction. Kelly stated that he feels the interior insulation solution is a better choice than putting it on the exterior.

The commission concurred with the DRC that the applicable standards are met. For *Standard 3*, for the doors, there were always barn doors on both the east and west ends of the building, particularly sliding doors, although rolling doors and pedestrian doors were used at other times. The interior modifications to the building necessitate permanently closing several of these doors. However, leaving false doors in place will give the sense of the original style and approximate location of the original doors as they will be based on historic photos. The new windows on the south side are intended to allow light into the interior, and as they can be viewed from anywhere inside the barn, the preference is to have them match the windows on the north. While there were never windows on the south shed addition there were windows on the south side of the barn itself. They were enclosed once the shed addition was completed. Transferring the location of the south side windows

to the shed addition is not conjectural, but an approximation to the interior of the daylight that was originally intended there. The south side is also the least significant elevation, as it was never prominently visible from the house or any of the adjacent roadways.

For *Standard 5*, the primary distinctive feature of the barn is the barrel vaulted roof. The exterior visual qualities of the roof will be preserved by not insulating the exterior of the roof. Had the insulation occurred on the exterior, the roof would have appeared thicker and out of scale. The interior structural components will be retained but will be partially covered with insulation and a new false ceiling. This false ceiling is a duplicate of the original, using material salvaged in part from the loft floor. The new ceiling is only a few inches below the existing one, therefore imperceptible to the eye when viewed from the floor of the barn.

For *Standard 9*, the exterior alterations include new windows, false doors, new interior ceiling and a different material on the shed roofs. For the new windows, only relatively small sections of historic siding will be removed to allow for installation of the windows. The new windows will match the original windows on the north side in size, shape, and material, but the construction methods will be modern and the use of insulated glazing will sufficiently differentiate them from historic windows. The addition of egress doors on the south elevation will also sufficiently differentiate the symmetry of this elevation as compared to the all window north elevation. For the false doors, no historic materials are being removed, and the doors will match the historic ones in appearance and material, but will not be operable. For the interior ceiling, no historic materials are being removed, just covered up. The spatial relationship of the loft will not change as the new ceiling will be only a few inches below the existing and the existing joists will be retained and visible. It will replicate the old using salvaged materials from the loft floor, and similar techniques. It will be sufficiently differentiated because it will not exhibit the patina of the old, namely heavy water stains and areas of rot. For the shed roofs, corrugated metal was used previously, and the new material will be compatible in color, form, and scale, but will not have the patina of the original.

For *Standard 10*, the false barn doors and shed roof material could easily be removed without impacting the historic integrity of the property. Only small holes where the doors are attached would remain and these could easily be filled. The roofing would have to be replaced with another roofing material. It is unlikely the windows would be removed, but if they were, the openings could be easily recovered using new siding material that matches the old, as it is a common building material and should be readily available. The interior ceiling could also be removed to re-expose the original one, but it would be a greater challenge to remove the sprayed insulation covering the original. However, the historic form of the original ceiling would not be impacted by removing the new one.

Hudson moved to approve the Type II COA to modify roofing and fenestration on the Olof Olson Barn as recommended by the DRC and to ratify the agreement between DRC and the applicant, with the condition that photos of the completed project be submitted to commission staff. The motion passed unanimously, with McCormick and Handy abstaining.

**NEW BUSINESS:** Sundberg gave an overview of the upcoming strategic plan update and provided the commission with some background information on previous plans.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:20.

**APPROVED MARCH 26, 2013**